

**\*\*NOT FOR PRINTED PUBLICATION\*\***

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
LUFKIN DIVISION

SALVADOR JIMENEZ

§

VS.

§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:20cv176

DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID

§

ORDER ACCEPTING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner Salvador Jimenez, proceeding *pro se*, filed the above-styled petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court referred this matter to the Honorable Keith F. Giblin, United States Magistrate Judge, for consideration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and applicable orders of this court. The Magistrate Judge has submitted a Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge concerning this matter. The Magistrate Judge recommends the petition be dismissed without prejudice as successive.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record and pleadings. No objections were filed to the Report and Recommendation.

ORDER

The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Magistrate Judge are correct and the report of the Magistrate Judge is **ACCEPTED**. A final judgment shall be entered in accordance with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.

In addition, the court is of the opinion that the petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying federal habeas relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* U.S.C. § 2253. The standard that must be met in order to receive a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000);

**\*\*NOT FOR PRINTED PUBLICATION\*\***

*Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner is not required to demonstrate that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he need only demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented in the petition are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. If the petition was dismissed on procedural grounds, the petitioner must show that jurists of reason would find it debatable: (1) whether the petition raises a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484; *Elizalde*, 362 F.3d at 328. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty imposed on the petitioner may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

In this case, the petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether his petition is successive is subject to debate among jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions raised by petitioner have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. As a result, a certificate of appealability shall not issue in this matter.

So ORDERED and SIGNED, Sep 22, 2020.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Clark", written over a horizontal line.

Ron Clark  
Senior Judge